Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 16, 21, 30-32, 37, 38, 43, 44, 46, 47, 50, 52-60, and 63-88 are pending with claims 1, 16, 21, 30, 50, and 52- 54 being the independent claims. Claims 2-13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 27-29, 33, 36, 39, 42, 45, and 48 were previously canceled. Claims 14, 18, 20, 23-26, 34, 35, 40, 41, 48, 49, 51, 61, and 62 are sought to be canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. New claims 87 and 88 are sought to be added. Claims 1, 16, 21, 30, 50, and 52-54 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to claims 1, 16, 21, 30, 50, and 52- 54 are supported by the Specification. For example, FIGS. 5 and 6 and paragraphs 00128-00147 of the Specification, as filed, provide support for the amendments.

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 14, 16, 18, 21, 30, and 49-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 14, 18, 49, and 51 have been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of those claims has been rendered moot. Furthermore,

Applicants have amended claims 1, 14, 18, 21, 30, and 49-54 to remove the claim

recitation cited by the Examiner. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection

of claims 1, 16, 21, 30, 50, and 52-54 has been overcome.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23-26, 30-32, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47,

and 49-86 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S.

Patent No. 6,694,336 to Multer et al. ("Multer").

Claims 14, 18, 20, 23-26, 34, 35, 40, 41, 48, 49, 51, 61, and 62 have been

cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claims

Claims 14, 18, 20, 23-26, 34, 35, 40, 41, 48, 49, 51, 61, and 62 has been rendered moot.

Multer describes a system that has at least one application including application

data in a format in an application data store. See, Multer, Abstract. Multer describes

transferring data between two devices. To reduce the amount of information transmitted

over a network, only the difference between data on the transmitter and corresponding

data on the intended receiver is transmitted. For example, in FIG. 1 of Multer, difference

information Δ is transmitted from System A to System B. Difference information Δ

includes changes to data stored on System B, e.g., made by System A. See, Multer, Col.

5, lines 62-64. FIGS. 2-5 show similar systems in which a device only receives

difference information Δ including changes to data stored on the device.

Multer describes two data transfer operations: a pull synchronization operation

(e.g., FIG. 15 of Multer) and a push synchronization operation (e.g., FIG. 16 of Multer).

In a pull synchronization operation, devices are updated based on data from a storage

server. Specifically, a triggering event commences the operation, e.g., a user pressing a sync button. The storage server is then checked to determine whether a new version of data exists on the server. If so, the new version of the data is retrieved. See, Multer, Col. 36, line 12 – Col. 37, line 24.

In a push synchronization, the storage server is updated based on information on a device. Specifically, if changes have been made to data, appropriate Δ's are created. A connection is then established with a server, during which the Δ's are uploaded. See, Multer, Col. 38, line 49 – Col. 39, line 5.

Multer does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. For example, claim 1, as amended, recites "determining that the second device has transitioned from an off-line state to an on-line state." There is no description in Multer that teaches or suggests determining that a device has transitioned from an off-line state to an on-line state.

Furthermore, claim 1 also recites "updating the state of data on the second device stored on the first device based on a confirmation received from the second device, wherein the received confirmation indicates at least that the modification was successfully recovered." Multer, in discussing the pull and push synchronization operations, does not teach or suggest a confirmation that is used by the sending device to update the state of data on the receiving device. At most, the push synchronization operation describes the sending device determining the version of the data last sent to the receiver (storage server). However, this version information is updated when the device sends the data and is not updated based on a received confirmation.

Thus, Applicants assert that Multer does not teach or suggest every feature of

claim 1. Independent claims 1, 16, 21, 30, 50, and 52- 54 recite similar features as claim

1 and are patentable over Multer for at least the reasons provided above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of independent

claims 1, 16, 21, 30, 50, and 52- 54 and their respective dependent claims be

reconsidered and withdrawn.

New Claims 87 and 88

Claim 87, which depends from independent claim 1, and claim 88, which

depends from independent claim 30, are patentable over the applied references at least in

view of their dependency to their respective independent claim, and further in view of

their own respective features.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.
OMAR AMIN, Reg. No. 60,885
for

Michael Q. Lee
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,239

Date: 3/2/2009

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

906024_1.DOC